

Message

From: Cooke, Daniel W. [cookedw@cdmsmith.com]
Sent: 2/14/2018 4:58:09 PM
To: LaPoma, Jennifer [LaPoma.Jennifer@epa.gov]; Scott Kirchner [kirchnersf@cdmsmith.com]
CC: Salkie, Diane [Salkie.Diane@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: supplemental memo
Attachments: DRAFT_11-PrinceMemo_17MILE_2.14.18_DC-edit_021418.docx

Hi Jen,

Attached is the document you sent (not the one Scott sent earlier – in case there are dueling versions floating around), with a paragraph added to describe the PCDD and TEQ. I tried to keep it brief, and added it to the text just above where you added a line stating, “The Revised BERA (Revision 2) describes risk to different receptor groups.” The text I added is below:

The PCDD/PCDF TEQ is the Toxic Equivalent (TEQ) of the polychlorinated dibenzo-p-dioxins (PCDD)/polychlorinated dibenzo-furans (PCDF). The TEQ is a toxicity-weighted value based on the estimated toxicity of various dioxin-like compounds relative to TCDD (which is considered to be the most toxic form). Each of the compounds is associated with a Toxicity Equivalency Factor (TEF) of less than one (TCDD = 1), which represents its toxicity relative to TCDD. The TEQ is the sum of the concentrations of the dioxin-like compounds multiplied by their TEFs. Because of the variability in susceptibility to dioxin-like effects to different wildlife receptors, separate TEFs have been developed for fish, birds, and mammals.

Please let me know if this is what you had in mind, or if you need more/different/better.

Thanks,
Dan

From: LaPoma, Jennifer [mailto:LaPoma.Jennifer@epa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, February 14, 2018 11:17 AM
To: Kirchner, Scott <KirchnerSF@cdmsmith.com>; Cooke, Daniel W. <cookedw@cdmsmith.com>
Cc: Salkie, Diane <Salkie.Diane@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: supplemental memo

I’m in a meeting until noon so cant talk now.

Attached is the draft 11 principles memo. You’ll see in the revised copy that the BERA discussion that is now in the 11 principles was formerly in the Supplemental Memo. In the 11 principles, eco risk discussion, we introduce some acronyms and terms (PCDD, TEQ) without defining what they are.

Maybe this could be addressed by spelling out an acronym for the first time, but I would imagine for something like TEQ (maybe others – I’m not sure) there needs to be some additional discussion about what it is. Maybe that is a footnote or revising the language that leads into the bullet points where the acronyms first show up.

Could you address these comments and send back to me in redline

From: Kirchner, Scott [mailto:KirchnerSF@cdmsmith.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 14, 2018 11:09 AM
To: Cooke, Daniel W. <cookedw@cdmsmith.com>
Cc: LaPoma, Jennifer <LaPoma.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Salkie, Diane <Salkie.Diane@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: supplemental memo

Dan, we're changing up the Eco sections of the CATAG memos. See item below and attached memos note they are from yesterday. The message below is regarding comments I had on the supplemental memo.

Jen I'm not clear on the direction below if you are looking for information to go into the 11 principles or supplemental. I have several phone calls stacked up maybe you can get on a call with Dan. That would be the easiest way to get this wrapped up.

Let me know if you need to chat with me. I'm free for the next half hour.

Scott F. Kirchner

From: LaPoma, Jennifer [mailto:LaPoma.Jennifer@epa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, February 14, 2018 10:58 AM
To: Kirchner, Scott <KirchnerSF@cdmsmith.com>
Cc: Salkie, Diane <Salkie.Diane@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: supplemental memo

Thanks Scott – I agree about switching out the Eco discussion from the supplemental memo into the 11 Principles Memo.

I will need a couple things to do that – presumably from you or Dan –

There is discussion of PCDD, PCDF, and TEQ. That is the first time they are discussed in the memo so we'll need some revision to the language to lead into what these are

- PCDD/PCDF TEQ (based on fish-TEQ, bird-TEQ, and mammal-TEQ)

From: Kirchner, Scott [mailto:KirchnerSF@cdmsmith.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 13, 2018 5:47 PM
To: LaPoma, Jennifer <LaPoma.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: supplemental memo

Sorry I could not get to this sooner. I think our only problem is with the risk assessment sections

Scott F. Kirchner

From: LaPoma, Jennifer [mailto:LaPoma.Jennifer@epa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, February 13, 2018 4:40 PM
To: Kirchner, Scott <KirchnerSF@cdmsmith.com>
Subject: RE: supplemental memo

Thanks! Think Keegan will get me his rewrite before I leave?

From: Kirchner, Scott [mailto:KirchnerSF@cdmsmith.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 13, 2018 4:30 PM
To: LaPoma, Jennifer <LaPoma.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: supplemental memo

I got pulled into a phone call as well. I think document is in pretty good shape though.

Scott F. Kirchner

From: LaPoma, Jennifer [<mailto:LaPoma.Jennifer@epa.gov>]

Sent: Tuesday, February 13, 2018 4:26 PM

To: Kirchner, Scott <KirchnerSF@cdmsmith.com>

Subject: supplemental memo

Importance: High

Scott – Do you think you could send me what you guys have done so far on the supplemental memo?

I need to get it out to reviewers tonight along with the 11 principles memo and I'm only here for another hour